

**CITY COUNCIL/ PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT WORK SESSION
AUGUST 25, 2011**

City Council Members: Dana Williams, Cindy Matsumoto, Alex Butwinski, Dick Peek, Liza Simpson, Joe Kernan

Planning Commission: Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Julia Pettit, Jack Thomas, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Nann Worel

Ex Officio: Mark Harrington, Polly Samuels McLean, Francisco Astorga, Katie Cattan, Kayla Sintz, Matthew Evans, Michael Kovacs, Phyllis Robinson, Tom Bakaly

Mayor Dana Williams opened the joint work session at 6:15 p.m.

Charles Buki, a consultant from Alexandria, Virginia, was hired by the City to work with the City Council and Planning Commission on a range of issues. This was the third joint work session. The City Council and Planning Commission had participated in a survey and the primary objective this evening was to discuss the results. Mr. Buki stated that in facilitating the last two sessions, he heard five main issues. One was to follow the data presented by the design workshop and the summary of Vision 2009. He believed there was consensus that redevelopment is necessary. The second issue was that redevelopment is necessary; however, it must be prioritized regularly and annually with what was agreed to at the first meeting. They have not yet worked out the how and why details of the process, but it should be jointly done with Staff involvement, and not shunted from one component to another.

Mr. Buki remarked that the third issue was that redevelopment decisions needed to be grounded in individual district definitions. What the posture for leadership in Park City might be for one section of town might not dictate somewhere else. That would have to be formalized in the planning and redevelopment process.

Mr. Buki stated that the fourth issue was a portfolio context. As an example, they have one set of priorities for Lower Park and another set of priorities for Old Town. The two are in the same marketplace and need to be in balance. The final issue was the core values that were identified in 2009. They can be difficult to interpret, and they need more clarity to push them down further.

Mr. Buki noted that in the first two meetings the Planning Commission and Council talked about trade-offs. To that issue, they would be discussing the term "give and get" this evening. Mr. Buki remarked that at the end of the second meeting they talked about equity, particularly affordable housing, and what happens when the market and housing prices outpace incomes. To intervene requires resources and resources trigger a trade-off question.

Mr. Buki stated that three weeks ago they designed a survey and everyone present participated. The surveys were anonymous. He had aggregate data for what everyone in the group had expressed. He would go through the results of the survey and then try to apply the survey results. One would be to look for district clarity and direction, focusing on Lower Park, Bonanza Park, and Old Town at a high level. They would look at the "give and get" implications for each of the three and the supplement plan issue. Mr. Buki intended to work specifically on Bonanza Park this evening. Lower Park and Old Town had their own issues to be addressed. Most importantly they

needed to work on strategic plan priorities with regards to redevelopment, apply agreements to the specific areas, and get a real framework for the strategy and how it lines up with the General Plan process.

Mr. Buki pointed out that much of the discussion this evening would be review. As a facilitator, he would be looking for indications that he was accurately interpreting their comments. He would take silence as sign of agreement. Mr. Buki stated that if someone had a complaint, this was the time to make it known.

Mr. Buki stated that the Visioning take away was to keep Park City as Park City. It is easy to say but difficult to do and hard to understand what it means. Essentially they had building blocks that were value based, which included sense of community, small town feel, historic character and natural setting. In the first session they determined that it implied that certain choices and trade-offs would need to be made. When they look at all the influences and characteristics, they end up with categories of environment, economy, equity and quality of life. Mr. Buki referred to those as measureable categories. With some metrics and objectivity on a quantifiable basis, when proposals come forward they can be somewhat confident that they are agreeing to something that gives equity for a trade-off, such as environment or economic prosperity.

Mr. Buki stated that in the survey he tried to poll the group to get a sense of how they ranked the issues on a city-wide and district basis. As a body, they would be accountable for these positions and not allow it to sit stagnant. It is important that they be clear about what they want. Mr. Buki noted that in the survey they were asked to prioritize the core values, and as they applied them to Old Town, Bonanza Park and Lower Park, to prioritize these measures in the same areas by district. They were asked to describe the current and future character of each, using planning terms and current and future functions. The survey also asked the participants for a list of uses that should be encouraged as well as discouraged. In terms of gives and gets there are many tools, including tax abatement, cash tools, and cash in lieu of tools. The survey specifically focused on two; density and height.

Mr. Buki reviewed the following table and discussed the survey results.

	OLD TOWN	BOPA	LOPA
CORE VALUES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Character • Sense of Community • Small Town (feel) • Natural Setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of Community • Small Town (feel) • Natural Setting • Historic Character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of Community • Historic Character • Small Town (feel) • Natural Setting
MEASURES/ LEVERS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of Life • Economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economy • Equity • Quality of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity • Quality of Life

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity • Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economy • Environment
CHARACTER – NOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic • Funky • Threatened • Cultural/Arts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underutilize • Rundown • Uniform • Uninviting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking Identity • Underutilized • Rundown • Uninviting
CHARACTER – FUTURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic • Vibrant • Funky • Cultural/Arts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vibrant • Affordable • Multi-Generational • Contemporar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable • Diverse • Inviting • Strong Identity
FUNCTION – NOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurant • Tourist • Shopping • Visitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use • Small Business • Everyday • Commercial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurant • Recreation • Residential • Open Space
FUNCTION – FUTURE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurant • Tourist • Shopping • Visitor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use • Local • Small Business • Everyday 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurant • Open Space • Recreation • Visitor

Mr. Buki stated that based on the survey for Old Town, historic character and sense of community out-ranked natural setting and small town feel. The overwhelming core value was historic character. Natural setting was rated the lowest.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know how many people were asked to participate in the survey and how many responded. Mr. Buki replied that everyone on the Planning Commission and the City Council were asked to take the survey and everyone responded

Mr. Buki stated that quality of life and economy were two critical pieces for measuring “gives and gets”. The environment for Old Town ranked low. In terms of character and function now, everyone described it as historic and funky. They also said it was threatened and had a large cultural and arts component. In terms of function, it was restaurants, district tours, oriented shopping district, and visitors. In terms of how they see Old Town’s future, it was very similar to how it is now. One difference was that they replaced threatened with vibrant. Therefore, when it comes time to develop a policy position on Old Town, they need to be thinking about what is specifically threatened, what they mean by vibrant, how the two relate, and what it says about redevelopment or General Plan implications for that district.

Mr. Buki remarked that the survey reflects what they said. When it comes time for development strategy planning, if they back off from what they said in the survey, it is important to know the specifics of why they were backing off.

Council Member Matsumoto stated that she was conflicted with natural setting. Having the natural setting is crucial and she did not want it to go away; but natural setting is given and she could not understand how they would have the ability to make it go away. For that reason she looked at other values to be number one. Ms. Buki understood her concern because the meaning is unclear. He stated that as they break into small working groups or partner with Staff, they need to go one step further and think about what those values specifically mean with regards to Old Town.

Mr. Buki provided survey results for Bonanza Park and noted that sense of community and small town feel outpaced natural setting and historic character. The “give and get” levers were economy and equity. He pointed out that in Old Town quality of life was extremely important. In Bonanza Park it was the economy, which he has always used as economic prosperity. However, it is counter-weighted with equity. Mr. Buki noted that all the survey participants checked boxes for under-utilized, rundown, uniform, uninviting. He clarified that the question only rated the character. It did not mean that Bonanza Park does not generate revenue or was not prosperous. Regarding current function, the survey showed mixed-use, small business, responsive to everyday needs of the community, and commercial in nature. They all wanted it vibrant and affordable, multi-generational and contemporary. He noted that local rose to the top priority.

Commissioner Pettit joined the meeting at 6:34 p.m.

Mr. Buki remarked that the survey questions provided a number of opportunities to describe “local” in different ways. Commissioner Strachan stated that he had marked “everyday” on the character function of the future. It was high on his list because he thought Bonanza Park would be an area where they would go to get every day things such as soap and toothpaste. He asked how others saw that in the survey. Mr. Buki remarked that the survey provided a list of 16 answers and he only isolated the top four. Commissioner Strachan noted that “everyday” was ranked #4, but he was surprised that it had not ranked higher.

Council Member Simpson thought the answer for local also spoke to everyday. In her mind some of it was a trade-off, but it was not meant to be based to the ski area.

Mr. Buki presented the survey results for Lower Park Avenue, noting that sense of community rated very high. He felt that was accurate because it matched the conversation at the last meeting and it was consistent with the 2009 Visioning. Mr. Buki stated that this was when equity rose to the top, and the group had clearly expressed a viewpoint. If they have any control over what occurs with Lower Park, equity is an important factor. He indicated areas where environment was checked. Rather than assuming that environment was a low priority, Mr. Buki believed it was meant to satisfy the environmental requirements outside of the district in other ways. The survey also indicated that Lower Park lacks identity, is under-utilized, rundown and uninviting. The rankings for function were resort-dominated recreation, residential, open space and mixed use. He noted that affordable was

a universal response. Mr. Buki indicated the breakdown for equity, affordable, and diverse. He thought the equity argument was consistent.

Mr. Buki stated that the survey results as a whole created a redevelopment template. He remarked that six weeks ago when these sessions started, there was little clarity. They now have verbiage, service of boundaries, and some agreement on what should occur in each district. The problem to solve is how to get from the “now” to what they want in the future. Mr. Buki offered a possible solution process. He would look at the top levers, current functions and character, and the main future function and character as the core framing questions that need to be addressed. For example, in Old Town they need to look at what they would be giving up to get quality of life and revenue in Old Town, and at the same time maintain the historic fabric and a vibrant destination with restaurants and cultural arts. Mr. Buki clarified that he extracted the question from the survey.

In terms of Lower Park Avenue, the question is what to give up or pay for to get affordability and identity, but would still result in an inviting resort and recreation area with open space. He reminded them that they would have the ability to trade back and forth on some things. Mr. Buki commented on the importance of reaching a main objective in each of these districts.

Council Member Simpson referred to Lower Park Avenue and stated that when she answered the question she specifically considered the parks as open space, which included City Park and the park by the library. Mr. Buki understood that the intention was to protect existing open space. He remarked that the City could also decide to buy out four or five condos to create additional open space. Council Member Simpson clarified that from her perspective, it was about protecting and maintaining open space as opposed to trying to create more open space in that neighborhood.

Council Member Matsumoto recalled that one survey question specifically addressed parks. She shared Ms. Simpson’s perspective to maintain existing open space in the area. She also wanted trails and connectivity. Mr. Buki stated that when it came to trading density and height, one of the options was to trade for open space. He referred to the feedback from the survey to show the extent to which some were willing to place that as a high priority.

Commissioner Wintzer asked if Lower Park Avenue included the resort parking lot. Mr. Buki answered yes. Commissioner Wintzer thought that was confusing. Most of the questions related to what he considered Lower Park; however, the resort parking lot is more like its own island within that area. Commissioner Thomas agreed.

Mayor Williams stated that they were in the center of an urban area and when the community thinks of open space they think of Round Valley. He pointed out that Park City lacks a good definition of urban open space. He remarked that in Lower Park Avenue it is critical to have green spaces such as the City Park and the library field. He was unsure if Bonanza Park needed the same type of large park open space, but there was an evident need for large open areas where people could congregate. Mr. Buki suggested that they look towards the policy direction rather than the prescriptive direction, which is open space as a priority for specific reasons. It should be defined in the General Plan to represent the core, rather than articulate a specific strip of land as open space.

Council Member Matsumoto stated that her view of Lower Park included the resort parking lot. She noted that the re-development area stretches up to approximately Ninth Street, encompassing a large section of what people think of as Old Town. A residential area of Old Town is still in Lower Park Avenue. Ms. Matsumoto thought it was important to look at that as they delve into it further, because it is different from lower Lower Park Avenue.

Council Member Simpson concurred with Mayor Williams that they need a good definition of urban green space or open space. The spaces do not have to be large and they do not all need to be gathering spaces. Mr. Buki remarked on the importance of getting the definition reduced and as finite as possible going into the last stages of the General Plan re-write.

Commissioner Thomas thought it appeared they were looking at the matter as satellites or separate entities of unique neighborhoods. Mr. Buki replied that they were for now. Commissioner Thomas assumed they would eventually talk about how they connect the fabric of movement and green spaces through the community to knit the neighborhoods together. As an example, Boise has a river that strings the community together and runs through the neighborhoods. Commissioner Thomas believed the conversation was about more than just the neighborhoods. They also need to talk about how to connect them because that creates the vibrancy and dynamic of comparison and contrast and exposure and discovery.

Mayor Williams remarked that several years ago a few people from Park City attended a Designing Public Open Spaces Conference in Chicago. The keynote speaker was Joe Riley, the mayor of Charleston. Mayor Williams noted that downtown Charleston has a lot of pedestrian oriented areas where people congregate. However, during that conference they were shown time-lapsed photographs of expensive areas of public space that no one used. The spaces were nice but they did not draw people. They then showed what Mayor Riley had done over the course of 35 years in downtown Charleston by actually picking specific locations and defining what would occur in those spaces to draw people in and interconnect buildings and places. Mayor Williams thought the report from that conference could help them now in terms of trying to define what they are looking at and what urban open space means and how it functions. Mr. Buki stated that from the standpoint of urban design, at some point and as a matter of public policy, they would need to make a decision to invest in the connectivity of how places link to one another.

Mr. Buki stated that the next step was how to move from now into the future. He proposed that they take the districts apart, move the pieces around and test it out.

Commissioner Wintzer disclosed that he owns property in Bonanza Park and during the conversation he would try to discern whether or not he was talking from the standpoint of a property owner.

Mr. Buki remarked that the process so far had put them in a good position of communicating a set of redevelopment priorities, which is central and parallel to the process of rewriting the General Plan.

Mr. Buki suggested that they delve into Bonanza Park. The intent was to get clarity on their thoughts from a policy point of view when it comes to Bonanza Park and how it relates to the wider context.

Mr. Buki summarized the survey results for Bonanza Park, which pointed towards achieving a vibrant, affordable, multi-generational and contemporary area. He believed that raised three questions for discussion. The first was what the City is willing to give in order to get, and what it is they want. Council Member Matsumoto stated that they wanted affordable housing. Mr. Buki thought that made sense because equity was a priority lever. Council Member Matsumoto thought it was also important to have affordable rent for retail business. Mr. Buki presented an example of cost to the developer versus the affordable rate. He noted that the difference needs to be paid by someone, which is the give part by the City. The question is what they are willing to give. Mr. Buki emphasized that you have to give something to get something because nothing comes for free.

Mr. Buki remarked that the second question was what they wanted to encourage on a district basis, and what they wanted to discourage on both a district and city-wide basis. The survey gave them the opportunity to say what they did not want to see anywhere, under any circumstance. Part of this discussion was how that applies to Bonanza Park and what tools they can use to achieve it. He noted that a tax break was an example of a tool that could be used to recruit or retain certain types of small businesses.

Commissioner Strachan suggested that the universal tools the government had may be limited. He was unsure what tools they would have beyond a subsidy or a tax break or possibly a less restrictive Code. Mr. Buki replied that in general they could bond and pay with cash. He noted that many communities streamline the approval process to encourage getting what they want. He noted that density and height are the major tools for areas that have a growth boundary.

Commissioner Strachan stated that for future meetings, when they talk about the General Plan they should think about additional tools. Many of the available tools have been used in the past but have not always worked. He was certain they could come up with better ideas. Mr. Buki replied that the tools he mentioned were the ones most commonly in play, but he encouraged them to look for other tools.

Regarding encouragements and discouragements, according to the survey, the number one answer for Bonanza Park was to encourage locally-owned commercial. The second was to encourage affordable housing. The third was to encourage a small business incubator. They also wanted to encourage parks, open space, and some type of campus. They wanted medium-size commercial, and were unwilling to encourage a multi-use facility expo center. Mr. Buki stated that they discouraged single-family homes, a museum, and big-box business. They also discouraged nightly rentals. Council Member Kernan asked where hotels ranked on the survey, noting that Bonanza Park currently has hotels. Mr. Buki replied that hotels were lower on the list.

Mr. Buki remarked that the data showed consensus and a strong sentiment to discourage big-box business anywhere in Park City. There was overwhelming consensus to encourage affordable housing. Discouraging national franchise scored high. A multi-use expo center facility scored fairly

high, yet something that was discouraged for the entire City was a mini-convention center.

Mayor Williams asked what that meant in terms of the results, where something ranks high in encouragement, but ranks low for being acceptable anywhere in the City. Mr. Buki replied that it was a split.

Regarding hotels, City Council Member Simpson remarked that Park City is a sophisticated community and they make bright line differentiations between a hotel, nightly rental, condominiums versus stacked flats versus duplexes. When she answered that question, she was thinking about nightly rentals as being completely different from a hotel. She thinks of condominiums as nightly rentals, as opposed to a hotel or a bed and breakfast. Ms. Simpson thought they may be seeing the same language difficulty with the expo, multi-event center. In random discussions, the only consensus was that a multi-event facility needed to be a size that could house Sundance screenings. There was a large range in discussion regarding what that facility might look like.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that the Planning Commission has never had the opportunity to discuss that type of facility. City Council Member Simpson clarified that the City Council has not had that discussion. She was referring to random public conversations.

Mr. Buki pointed out that there were different ideas on what this means, and until there is clarity on the issue, they would have a harder time voting for or against something that is described as a multi-use facility.

Mr. Buki recommended two important questions that should drive the discussion as they begin to transcend planning and move to redevelopment strategies for any of the districts. The first question was what they want to encourage or prevent, and the form of payment for getting the "wants". The second question was whether both the City Council and Planning Commission were fully aware that the choice set is rarely what is proposed versus what they want; and more typically, what is proposed versus what is allowed. Mr. Buki stated that like most Planning Commissions and Councils across the Country, they wrestle with what is proposed versus what they want, and that is a false choice. They need to redirect their thinking to what is proposed versus what is allowed. As an example, they may not want a national franchise, but if it is allowed by Code they would need to find a way to buy-down that developer or owner. Another option would be to change the Code.

Council Member Matsumoto thought planning was one of their biggest tools to get what they want. Mr. Buki replied that planning is the tool box and only half of the process. The other half is how to pay for it. He used the bond issue as an example of having to pay to get what they want.

Council Member Simpson believed Ms. Matsumoto was referring to a comment the Mayor had made a number of times, that in the past they used to incentivize affordable housing and now they require it. Mr. Buki stated that as the market exploded from 1992 to 2000 it migrated from an incentive to a requirement. It reached a point where front end environmental costs, front end pre-development planning, and the subsidies to deliver the affordable requirements were close to \$200,000 per unit in a \$650,000 market. When the spigot opened for financing, the developers took

the advantage. However, when the market began to change direction, the community had to realize that it was no longer viable for developers to meet the requirements. Mr. Buki suggested that the City look at the arc and consider whether this was the type of market they want going forward. He cautioned them to be careful about how much they require and what effect it would have on someone's decision to move forward.

Council Member Kernan thought they needed to better define national franchise. Mr. Buki noted that there was a peril to naming one franchise, since its definition would cause individuals to feel one way or another based on how they feel about the service or product it provides. Mr. Buki provided examples of McDonalds, Walgreens, CVS, Hooters and In & Out Burger, which there was no consensus to allow or prohibit, and asked why they were relevant to Bonanza Park.

Council Member Simpson thought the franchise question may have been more driven by size. She was not fond of having a national chain like the Harley store on Main Street, but it may work in Bonanza Park. Mr. Buki noted that it was clear from the survey that a chain they would not want to allow in one area may make sense in another area. Based on the survey, resistance to a national franchise spoke to Walmart, fast food chains, medium size pads, and national retailers similar to Kimball Junction. Nearly everyone in the survey made it clear that they do not want Park City to be anywhere USA.

Council Member Kernan pointed out that for some items people run to Walmart, Costco, Home Depot and other national chain or big box retailers. He suggested that if Park City had a larger store, such as a Target, that was hidden by smaller locally owned stores, it would keep the sales revenues in town and the community could purchase those types of items without having to drive to Kimball Junction.

Mayor Williams pointed out that Kimball Junction and Silver Creek provide that type of retail and is not that far away. Historically, the size of the buildings on Main Street has been the biggest deterrent for big box and chains in Park City, and that has controlled the business district. It was very limited in terms of what national chain could utilize that space. Harley came up with a good idea. It is a nice space and they did a good job. Mayor Williams stated that Burger King was another chain that changed their normal form to fit in the community. Most chains are not willing to make those changes. Mayor Williams was adamant that the majority of people in the community do not want big box stores in Park City. Mr. Buki stated that the Mayor's opinion was supported by the survey.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was a distinction between big box and franchise, because there are franchises in Park City. Commissioner Wintzer believed the issue was size. During the General Plan re-write for Bonanza Park they spent many hours talking about size to make sure they did not allow something that would discourage local business. In the end, no one would formulate a size and it was left open. Commissioner Savage asked if it was possible to have a Code that prohibits a national franchise regardless of the size of the property. Mr. Buki stated that they could set up local districts if it was allowed by State law. He noted that the encouragements and discouragements for the General Plan were still a non-binding framework. In Bonanza Park what they discourage can still occur. Therefore the position is what is proposed versus what is allowed,

rather than what is proposed versus what they want. Mr. Buki felt it was important for them to acknowledge that fact, recognizing that it is not limited to Bonanza Park. The message during the design workshop was that if competition is waning and not in reactive mode, the City should take the same position.

Planner Katie Cattan asked if the consensus was definitely on size and not the economy. Using Council Member Kernan's example of a small, less visible Target, she asked if the issue was the size of the building or the money that flows through it. Commissioner Wintzer believed there were two parts to the issue. One was the desire for local owned commercial business. The second part is that a franchise is designed to attract people from outside the local community. The question is whether they want to invite people from Heber to shop in Park City or whether they want to keep it for the locals. Mr. Buki believed the question went further than that. There is merchandise that appeals to local customers, and the local equity of the cash flow for local ownership. There is also real estate ownership. Both can be local/non-local. He remarked that the City has to determine what they mean by local and to decide what is too big in terms of size. Mr. Buki pointed out that size is only part of the issue. Companies that reduced the size of their buildings still found that people objected to other things such as products from China. Mayor Williams remarked that recently the Ritz Hotel chain disregarded their standardized model on the realization that their typical architectural design could not be used in certain markets because the communities would not accept it.

Mr. Buki stated that the City Council and Planning Commission needed to go through their planning tools to see if they were sufficient to shape, confirm, ratify or reject what they want for Bonanza Park.

Council Member Simpson thought it was important to first define local. She thought it was more than just a square footage question. It is a combination of size and function. They need to qualify what they mean by a business that serves locals, which is also part of the local definition. She pointed out that Subway is a national franchise but it is locally owned. When she looks at the word "everyday", a CVS fits in. Mr. Buki encouraged the group to visit the Triangle District outside of Santa Fe to see a completely local area that is funky and contemporary, but does not affect Santa Fe's core city.

Mr. Buki commented on height and density as City-wide tools. He noted that nearly everyone in the survey was willing to give up height if they could be assured of getting an adopted neighborhood design guideline for Bonanza Park. High votes also went to open space, smaller building footprint, reduced Co2, benefits to local business, protection of view corridor, affordable housing. As a group, they said that if a proposal came forward and it appeared to fit what they wanted to achieve, they would be willing to trade height. However, the fact that protecting the view corridor was part of the trade-off indicated that they were not willing to trade a lot of height. Mr. Buki clarified that three people who took the survey would never trade height. He stated that height results in more revenue, but it has a consequence of creating a street wall if it is done poorly.

Mr. Buki remarked that four people would not consider trading density, and all four came from the same body. For those willing to consider density, it was in play as long as it protects historic

structures, had right-of-way dedications that provide better connectivity, affordable housing, environmental gains, reduced Co2, and if there was an adopted neighborhood design guideline.

Commissioner Savage found it confusing to consider this on a city-wide basis. He could imagine people having very strong positions on questions related to height and density in certain parts of town.

Council Member Matsumoto wanted to know why they would have to pay in height or density for neighborhood design guidelines. She did not understand why they could not just have design guidelines. Mr. Buki clarified that the survey showed they would be more inclined to talk about height exceptions only if the trade-offs were in place. Without a guideline, height and density would be off the table. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that you can do things in a design guideline that are hard to do in the Code. If they can achieve a design guideline that targets the direction they want to go, it modifies the Code without an actual Code modification because the owner of the property agreed to build to specific standards. Mr. Buki agreed. He remarked that having a design guideline closes the gap on trying to work with the LMC to allow a project they like, or find a way to disallow a proposal they do not like.

Council Member Matsumoto stated that she favored design guidelines for the neighborhoods and thought that she may have misunderstood the question. Mr. Buki stated that from the survey he heard a clear directive for neighborhood design guidelines.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington, reminded everyone that the pay equation ties back to the postures they talked about at the second joint work session. They would have the ability in subgroups to define the postures in terms of whether they want to facilitate or regulate redevelopment. For example, in Old Town they may want a primarily regulatory approach with nominal redevelopment facilitation with "it depends" factors. On the other hand, they may decide to have a facilitating posture of affordable housing in a Lower Park neighborhood, and throw away the regulatory book to achieve that goal. Mr. Harrington pointed out that the pay equation allows the flexibility to have both without being pro-growth or no-growth.

Tom Bakaly understood that the choices were to be more regulatory and tighten up the holes, or to have partnership and be facilitating. He recalled from the first meeting that the preference was more partnership and facilitating. Mr. Buki believed it was still an open question. Mayor Williams pointed out that the power substation in Bonanza Park creates a major hurdle. In his opinion, unless the City works in conjunction with the property owner to get the substation moved, it would have a detrimental effect on the overall redevelopment for both major land owners.

Council Member Kernan felt it was important to begin discussing the value of view corridors in different places. He also thought it was important to protect the view corridors inside the middle of the Bonanza Park District. It needs to be valuable for users of the District to enjoy. Commissioner Wintzer concurred. He also commented on the importance of having definitions they understand to be clear on what they would get.

Mr. Buki felt the group was ready to pressure test the conversation using Bonanza Park as a specific example.

Mr. Buki stated that Bonanza Park is a large area of land that the group described as under-utilized, rundown and uninviting. They were not happy with that and said they wanted Bonanza Park to be vibrant, affordable, multi-generational, and contemporary. They also wanted mixed-use, local emphasis, everyday needs and small business. Mr. Buki saw three major issues that would stand in their way. He noted that Rocky Mountain Power is obligated to upgrade service and they plan to build four new sites and upgrade the six existing sites in the region. One of the six sites to be upgraded is in the middle of Bonanza Park, and its location is problematic from a development perspective. Mr. Buki pointed out that moving the substation is a give and involves a cost. He remarked that if Rocky Mountain builds new sites, the result would be larger structures and taller poles, which would affect the desire to protect the internal view corridor. However, burying the poles and reducing view corridor obstruction is also a cost. Mr. Buki pointed out that this was only an issue if aesthetics mattered.

Mayor Williams thought it was a big issue in terms of the ability to sell real estate or whether people would want to live near it. City Attorney Harrington clarified that the power upgrades would occur regardless of what happens at Bonanza Park.

Commissioner Savage believed another major issue was the EPA Super Fund, and where to put the dirt. Finding a place to deal with dirt abatement is starting to be an expensive problem.

Council Member Simpson clarified that they were not talking about burying the power poles. It was more about dropping the base of the pole so the effective height on the view is lowered. Mr. Buki replied that they could drop the base, but they could also presumably bury some of those lines. He pointed out that they could do whatever they want, as long as they were willing to pay for it. They also have the option of not doing anything and to accept the station, its location and the taller poles; but that also has its own set of costs.

Mr. Buki stated that from his point of view, they were at a fork in the road with density, height, and cash as their primary tools. They have two ticking clocks; owner prerogative and a power company mandate. There is nothing they can do about the power mandate. Their vision statement is to keep Park City Park City, and they all articulated how they rank it in terms of Bonanza Park. Mr. Buki reiterated that there was consensus that redevelopment is necessary. However, everything they said they wanted could not occur unless they resolve the issue with the power station. Otherwise, they are back to what is proposed versus what is allowed. Mr. Buki stated that as a group, they need to figure out how they could use their tools to work towards their commitment to redevelopment.

Council Member Simpson stated that as opposed to being in a situation of what they want versus what is allowed, the power company is a developer that does not have to pay attention to what is allowed. Mr. Buki pointed out that they were not without options or tools, and there is a lot of flexibility. They are only constrained to the extent that they decide these are constraints.

Council Member Matsumoto asked how height and density could help them move power poles.

Commissioner Wintzer explained that if you give someone more density, that person would have a bigger profit and could pay to move the power poles.

Mr. Buki stated that those who were not willing to trade for density and height, were essentially saying that quality of life and view corridors were not important issues. However, if they said quality of life, view corridors, and affordable housing were high priorities, but they were not willing to pay for any of it with density and height, that puts the community in a difficult position. It was one thing to say that individually, but collectively they have to make a choice.

Council Member Simpson stated that she sat on a power task force for over a year and while Mr. Buki was right about upgrades, she was not willing to say it was a done deal. Discussions were still occurring regarding pole height, transmission lines, and substations, and the City still has ways to influence the outcome in addition to paying for height and density.

Commissioner Pettit noted that the Planning Commission heard a presentation from the representative from Rocky Mountain Power regarding the task force and what was projected. One of her concerns was how to integrate or incentivize renewable energy to help reduce the power needs or to produce their own power. Her question was whether the City had any control over the timeline based on the steps they might take to reduce consumption, or whether the upgrade was driven regionally and was out of their control. Council Member Simpson believed much of it was out of their control.

Mr. Buki remarked that the probability is separate from the fact of where the substation is currently located and whether or not there is an upgrade. Aside from the upgrade, the location of the substation is an impediment to parcel assembly and getting the type of development that might achieve what they want. To cure that issue the substation would need to be moved. Mr. Buki noted that the power company has consented to moving the substation, but not at their expense. Council Member Simpson believed the upgrade could be an opportunity in that situation. Mr. Buki agreed. The upgrading provides an opportunity for leverage to encourage the type of development they want, what it costs, and in what form.

Council Member Peek pointed out that Iron Horse Loop is extremely dense and none of the residents were present to voice their opinion. He believed that moving the substation could create its own set of issues if people object to alternative locations.

Mr. Buki remarked that a second point to get away from the specifics was the give/get placeholder. They all want an affordable Bonanza Park. He got a sense from the survey that they also wanted local merchants to have subsidized rent. The question is where the subsidy would come from. Whether it is the cost to move the substation, subsidized housing, subsidized commercial, or subsidized open space, he wanted the Council Members and Commissioners to discuss what they were willing to pay in height and density to get Bonanza Park to look like what they wanted in the survey.

Council Member Kernan referred to the previous comment regarding the impacts to residents on Iron Horse Loop. He noted that it would cost the City something if they trade for the impact.

Commissioner Wintzer thought it was a matter of trying to make people understand the value of height and density. Mr. Buki suggested that they have a height and density conversation to get a sense of what would be off-limits. Mr. Buki reminded everyone that "what is allowed" was still an issue. In his experience, what is allowed can be the opposite direction of what they want. For Bonanza Park there is a significant gap between allowed versus wants, and the difference is cash.

Council Member Kernan stated that he would rank the levers as height first, density second, and then raising taxes. Mr. Buki asked why Mr. Kernan ranked height over density. Mr. Kernan replied that minimizing the footprint and raising up buildings adds value to the developer and accomplishes some of their goals. It gives the developer revenue and the City gets open space and view corridors.

Mr. Buki asked if density was an issue that caused concern. Council Member Kernan noted that the survey showed that at least four people were not willing to trade density. He wanted to accomplish the goals but still be considerate of their interest and minimize density increases as much as possible.

Council Member Matsumoto stated that she was one who said height was acceptable but not density. Bonanza Park has so much allowed density already, and it would create significant impacts if all the density was used. She could not understand how they could give any more density in Bonanza Park.

Commissioner Wintzer believed the other side of that issue is what has the most value to the developer. If Bonanza Park is developed by number of years rather than number of units, giving another five years for development may not have value. Height and density that could be used right now would have more value. Commissioner Wintzer stated that in his opinion, height is a bigger value to the developer, and it would be easier to negotiate with height as opposed to density.

Council Member Simpson stated that if the starting point for density is what is currently allowed, she was unsure how they could add density without adding height because of the existing setbacks. Commissioner Savage clarified that you could add height without adding density. Council Member Simpson encouraged all of them to seriously think about the density and height issue because the cash options are limited. Commissioner Savage asked if Ms. Simpson thought there would not be public interest in a bond issuance related to minimizing the overall city-wide impact of having an extension to the power station in its current location with the power lines. Council Member Simpson clarified that she was talking about the "gets" they wanted in Bonanza Park. She was unsure how they could even frame that property tax question because the perception would be that it benefits one area and one developer.

Commissioner Pettit stated that in terms of the trade-offs for density and height, the question is density and height to get more of what. For her personally, affordable housing would rank higher than retail or commercial. Commissioner Pettit thought they needed the ability to understand what the use would be to accommodate additional height or density. Mr. Buki understood that height and density would be considered as long as there was real clarity on the trade-off. Everyone concurred.

Commissioner Thomas stated that height and density are words that have no character, no vision, no architecture or amenity to the community, unless they can be programmed into the design guidelines. He was willing to consider balance and exchange for a better design and a better amenity to the rest of the community.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that he had filled out the survey while driving to Canada. He would read one question and take the opportunity to think about it for several hours before writing his answer and reading the next question. He also had time to change his answer on several questions. Commissioner Wintzer suggested that they all retake the survey after the conversation this evening to see if the results would change. Mr. Buki thought it would be beneficial if they were willing to do the survey again.

Tom Bakaly noted that some members of the public were in attendance, and he asked the group if they wanted to continue their discussion or take time to allow for public input. The question was raised as to whether another work session may be necessary. Mr. Bakaly was not opposed to a fourth work session if they were not ready to reach a conclusion this evening.

Mayor Williams stated that he would like to have time to re-read the guidelines that were identified for Bonanza Park. He felt other issues were significant enough to warrant more time and discussion. Mr. Bakaly remarked that if they wanted to take public input this evening, another work session could be scheduled and they could retake the survey.

Commissioner Savage preferred to hear public input. Council Member Butwinski agreed. If people take the time to attend they should have the opportunity to participate. Mr. Buki emphasized that at some point they would have to end the conversation and make a decision with imperfect information, and to make prioritization decisions. They needed to do it sooner rather than later.

Mayor Williams called for public input.

Neil Krasnik believed Park City has more unique demographics than any other place in the Country. The season for making money is December through March and he could not think of any other place that talks business saying that nothing would be done eight months of the year. Mr. Krasnik pointed out that in the 1980s the City traded height and density for the town lift project and now they are trying to spend money to get out of it.

Mr. Buki suggested that Mr. Krasnik consider reframing his question and take at face value the seasonal revenue observation he made. Mr. Buki stated that when he looks at the Park City numbers, he sees a 30 year mandate to not be stuck in the position of seasonal revenue dependency. Therefore, he would ask the question, what steps have to be taken in manipulating the environment to have revenue generation 10 or 12 months of the year, and what decisions need to be made now get more revenue opportunity in the future.

May Williams disagreed with the premise of the first question economically. He believed things have changed a lot and continue to change as they become more of a year-round resort.

Mark Fischer stated that he considers himself a friend and neighbor. He loves Park City, which is why in 1998 he started buying all the property in what is now Bonanza Park. Mr. Fischer stated that if he had any idea about the substation he would have never started. He is in a unique position because he owns the land the power company is talking about condemning for the expansion. The power company told him that the new substation must be operational by the end of 2014, which means they have to choose a site by the end of this year. Mr. Fischer noted that four sites are under consideration. The first site is the back of the Yard; the second site is the PCMR lot; the third site is below the new pump station on the entrance to Park Meadows across from Wells Fargo. Mr. Fischer stated that he and his partner offered a trade with no litigation to put the substation on land they own, which is where the current Park City Transportation and Deer Valley Lodging building are located. Through Tom Bakaly and Matt Cassel, they formerly offered the power company that land in exchange for vacating and giving them the land where the small substation is currently located, and move all the poles on the west side of Bonanza Drive to the east side of Bonanza Drive so they could redevelop. He also told the power company that their current plan would financially devastate him, and if they choose to condemn his land and take it, he would tie them up in court for as long as possible. Mr. Fischer pointed out that there will be no Bonanza Park if the substation expands in that location. Mr. Fischer stated that he has given the power company a viable solution. The big question was whether the citizens and the government would pay to underground the power lines in the most view corridor sensitive areas where the huge poles would be located. Mr. Fischer encouraged a fourth work session, as well as a presentation from the City Engineer.

Craig Elliott, architect and planner, stated that he works with Mr. Fischer on his projects. Everything he heard this evening was enlightening because it is consistent with what they want to do. Mr. Elliott remarked that the Mr. Fischer and the City need to work together on the substation issues. If they assume the substation problem can be resolved, they would need assistance in the Bonanza Park supplement, preferably more in the form of design guidelines versus written words. If those two things are in place, they will know what people are looking for and how those goals marry into the goals of the owners of the land. The end result would be a solution that works to process a project. If the Staff could write guidelines in the form of a General Plan supplement, it would be a great tool and a great way to use their skills. It would help everyone understand the goals and what needs to be done to get there.

Mayor Williams stated that the City has been meeting with Rocky Mountain Power regarding renewable energy projects. If the City was able to do everything they would like to do with renewable energy, it would be minimal in terms of what Rocky Mountain Power needs to provide. Part of the upgrade and expansion will service people beyond Park City.

Ruth Meintsma stated that if density, height, and cash were the tools to get the "gets", she wanted to know where amenities fit in. As an example, an amenity such as a plaza with trees and benches would encourage affordable and local businesses and attract people to Bonanza Park. Ms. Meintsma asked if amenities were a separate tool or whether it was included in the cash tool.

Mr. Buki replied that amenities would be another tool to consider. He recommended that they think of amenities as the icing because it is something that would increase the market.

Mr. Meintsma noted that often height is not the best first choice; however, height has an advantage that is not always considered. When a view corridor is removed or reduced because of height, there is also a view corridor allowed to that height it give views to the people who use that height. Mr. Meintsma pointed out that height also allows solar capacity, which would encourage the “gets”.

Mayor Williams thought the green elements would require a “give” on the part of the City. In order to get the green elements, the City would need to give up something in return because there is no requirement that forces the developer to add green elements.

Jennie, from PCMR, was very encouraged by the discussion and happy to hear them talk about a collective approach. She especially thanked Mr. Fischer for his stand on the power station because it is a huge issue for everyone. She thought it was important to recognize that while Mr. Fischer would get a better project if the substation is moved, but he would also be giving up quite a lot.

Mr. Fischer remarked that this is where they all chose to live and they are trying to create the best legacy they can. This was a perfect example of how to do that.

Mike Sweeney stated that one of the tools the City has is the ability to change the regulations in a way that streamlines the application process. Time is money. If a developer can get through the planning process and start to build in less time, it is worth a lot.

Council Member Butwinski stated that he lived in London for five years. There are a number of ground viewpoints as you travel around the City and it provides an interesting perspective. In his opinion, they should not be afraid of height because it can be architecturally inclusive in a way that has advantages. Commissioner Thomas agreed that a staccato of height and variations can be interesting and exciting.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that in addition to a fourth session, he thought they should do group homework to get the value out of the session. He understood it was a greater time commitment, but he thought it was important to be ready to look at maps and talk about trade-offs.

Commissioner Thomas stated that he worked at the power company for 19 years, eight of which was in the engineering department. He was willing to share his understanding and experience if they were interested.

Mr. Bakaly thought they should schedule another meeting and the Staff should provide additional information about the power station aid in making their decisions. The objective this evening was to define the redevelopment posture and strategy. Moving into the future he thought they would need small group discussions on the neighborhoods overall and the different attributes of different neighborhoods. Mr. Bakaly suggested having one more meeting to flush out the redevelopment posture prior to moving into the small group process.

Commissioner Strachan asked if the Staff's position was to have a city-wide redevelopment posture or if it would be broken down by neighborhood. Mr. Bakaly stated that they had already started to break it down by neighborhood based on the comments from the first meeting that it needed to be

neighborhood-wide. At this point the Staff believed that Bonanza Park was the first neighborhood that needed to be addressed right away, followed by Lower Park Avenue. Commissioner Strachan clarified that the Staff was looking for a redevelopment posture specific to Bonanza Park. Mr. Bakaly replied that this was correct.

Referring to the discussion this evening, Mayor Williams thought the question was whether to have the same the discussion on Lower Park and Old Town. He noted that the Old Town is comprised of approximately six neighborhoods. Many of the other residential neighborhoods are governed by CC&Rs.

Mr. Bakaly remarked that the balance they were trying to achieve at the Staff level was to have redevelopment posture and strategies for the two most important redevelopment areas. He believed the Planning Commission and City Council had affirmed that in their survey results for Lower Park and Bonanza Park. Commissioner Wintzer requested a map that would clarify the Lower Park Avenue area. Mr. Bakaly offered to provide additional information on Lower Park, along with information on the substation for the next meeting. He stated that the goal was to define a redevelopment posture to keep the General Plan process moving forward. He commented on the possibility of having to extend the April deadline for the General Plan. Commissioner Savage wanted to know what needed to be done to avoid extending the deadline. Mr. Bakaly replied that once they have direction and commitment on the redevelopment posture, the rest of the neighborhoods would begin to flow. If more than four meetings are required to make that decision, he believed extending the date would be inevitable.

Mr. Buki thought they were close to making that decision if they could make individual commitments to end the discussions sooner rather than later. Planner Katie Cattan stated that the Staff would need significant clarity on implementation. In order to bring the strategies forward, they need answers to the questions on height, density, dollars and "give and gets".

Mr. Bakaly summarized that they would be provided with the survey, maps, and guidelines. The next meeting would be scheduled within two to three weeks. Commissioner Wintzer asked if the map of Lower Park coincided with the RDA for Lower Park. Mr. Bakaly answered yes.

The Work Session was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.